

Academic Assembly
November 18, 2013
2:05 – 3:35pm, STCN 130

MINUTES

Present: Jeffrey Anderson, David Arnesen, Brady Carlson, Carol Wolfe Clay, Brooke Coleman, Lynn Deeken, Teresa Earenfight, Terry Foster, Kristi Lee, Michael Matriotti, Sean McDowell, David Neel, Katherine Raichle, Roshanak Roshandel, Rob Rutherford, Heath Spencer, Toni Vezeau, Cobretti Williams

Minutes taken by Rosa Hughes

- I. Review of 11-4-13 Minutes
 - A. Approved with one abstention
- II. Discussion of Student Proposal for Fossil Fuel Divestment
 - A. Discussion
 - 1. Need to know the budget impact to the university before we can make a decision
 - 2. Support student but would like to see both sides
 - 3. Don't recognize the names of the endorsing institutions, do recognize those who have not invested
 - 4. We are in a position to make a leadership statement to peer institutions
 - 5. Allows us to show solidarity with students and have the burden shift to the administration
 - 6. SGSU supported the resolution in general but reserved the right to do their own research
 - B. Vote on student resolution with no modifications
 - 1. Approved with two oppositions and one abstention
- III. Community Engaged Teaching and Scholarship (*Jeffrey Anderson, Claire Garoutte, Kristi Lee*)
 - A. Discussion taking place across the university about revising promotion and tenure guidelines in order to encourage and reward rigorous community engaged teaching, scholarship and service
 - B. 40-50 major institutions have revised their guidelines to reflect these changes including Loyola Marymount (Jesuit example), Michigan State (research example), Portland State (regional example)
 - C. Carnegie definition of community engagement: "Mutually beneficial exchange of knowledge and resources in a context of partnership and reciprocity."
 - D. Goals of proposed revision
 - 1. Expand what is rewarded at the university level, not to diminish or not acknowledge traditional discovery/integration knowledge
 - 2. Faculty have to prove the high quality of their community engaged scholarship, and so we will need institutional standards of rigor, quality, and impact
 - 3. Support the renewal of our Carnegie classification, which now addresses questions of community engaged scholarship with specific questions
 - 4. Encourage faculty to seek growing market for external funding available
 - 5. Increase faculty diversity – younger people, women, and people of color are more likely to participate in this work
 - E. Criteria

1. Clear goals, adequate preparation, appropriate methods, significant results, effective presentation, reflective critique
 2. Range of acceptable products including websites, workshops, diagnostic services (not all will be peer-reviewed journal articles)
 3. Measured by impact on community, including local, national, and international
 4. Acceptance of multiple funding sources
- F. Next steps
1. SU representatives are meeting with a national expert from University of Maryland in February
 2. Working with Faculty Handbook Revision Committee to revise handbook
 - a. Throughout the new version of the handbook, the idea of peer review is still a central idea for assessment of quality
 - b. With community engaged scholarship, it is important to also have review by someone capable of judging the community engagement success
- G. Discussion
1. Need to decide how standards are put into place about the relationship between the college/school and University Rank and Tenure Committee
 2. Colleges/schools will need to modify their internal definitions
 3. The Faculty Handbook revised language is a very general description that recognizes a wide range of scholarship, including community engaged
- IV.** Pending Programs Action Plan
- A. There is a time bottleneck to get all the new programs to the Board of Trustees by their February meeting
 - B. Options to either delegate some responsibilities to Program Review Committee or add more AcA meetings
 - C. Decision
 1. Program terminations and new program proposals come through AcA
 2. Program revisions and program reviews stay at PRC
 3. PRC can make recommendations to either elevate or not elevate any of the materials, in order to save AcA time
 4. Need to develop guidelines for what would prompt a full AcA review of program revisions and program reviews
 5. The memos for all four actions will still go to the full AcA
- V.** Graduate Strategic Enrollment Plan
- A. Executive summary was distributed to review
 - B. Schedule discussion for a future meeting
- VI.** Executive Session: Committees and Governance